

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, Claims 22-26 have been canceled, and claims 11 and 21 have been amended. Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

1. Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taneka et al. (US Patent No. 5,493,693, hereinafter Taneka). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

The Examiner stated in the outstanding office action that “transitioning from a secure mode to a clear mode call based on request from the user” is not recited in the claims. Therefore, Applicants have amended the claims to include this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that Taneka does not disclose transitioning from a secure mode to a clear mode during a secure-mode call based on a request from the user, as claimed. In contrast, Taneka teaches that “if the actually engaged communication channel were shifted from the digital mode (confidential) to analog mode (not confidential), then the mobile station PS generates an alarm to warn the user. . . . (Col. 11, lines 24-29). Nowhere in Taneka is there a mention of the user requesting a shift from an ongoing digital mode call to an analog mode. In Taneka, the user ends up involuntarily being in the analog mode as a result of losing the digital mode.

Therefore, since Taneka does not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 12-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A) in view of Mannisto (US005805084A). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses a handset entering a secure mode or staying in a clear mode based on whether the handset is in “secure-only” mode or “auto-secure” mode, as claimed and described in connection with FIG. 2 in the

PATENT

present application. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the "locked" and "dislocked" states of a keypad are the same as the claimed "secure-only" and "auto-secure" modes of communication, as explicitly described and defined in Sections [0008] through [0012] of the instant application, and shown in FIG. 2 in the present application. As admitted by the Examiner, (Office Action of 4/14/2005, Page 2, last four lines) "[t]he Examiner relies on Walter et al to teach a secure transmission mode, and Mannisto to teach the holding of a key for a delay period," none of these references discloses or suggests the claimed limitation of transitioning from secure mode to clear mode based on whether the handset is in "secure-only" mode or "auto-secure" mode.

Therefore, since Walter and Mannisto, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

3. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A) in view of Mannisto (US005805084A), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Alanara et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,205). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

As stated above, neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses the claimed limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Alanara does not disclose what Walter and Mannisto fail to disclose.

Therefore, since the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

4. Claims 6, 7, 8, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A) in view of Mannisto (US005805084A) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Harris et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,406 B1). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

As stated above, neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses the claimed limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Harris does not disclose what Walter and Mannisto fail to disclose.

PATENT

Therefore, since the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

6. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taneka et al. (US Patent No. 5,493,693) in view of Mannisto (US005805084A). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants have canceled these claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taneka et al. (US Patent No. 5,493,693) and Mannisto (US005805084A) in view of Walter et al. (US006151677A). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants have canceled these claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

PATENT

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 13, 2005

By: Abdollah Katbab
Abdollah Katbab, Reg. No. 45, 325
(858) 651-4132

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502